



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1560
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,080	12/30/2003	Philip M. Ramirez	P00920-US-01 (06579.0389)	7637
22446	7590	06/13/2006	EXAMINER	
ICE MILLER LLP ONE AMERICAN SQUARE, SUITE 3100 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46282-0200			VY, HUNG T	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2163		

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/748,080	RAMIREZ, PHILIP M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hung T. Vy	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/2/2004</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility. The claim 1 recites a computer readable medium. It is hardware so a computer readable medium cannot do itself the management, classification and protection of electronic document and/or records.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, and 7-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,122,663) in view of Suchter (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,161).

With respect to claims 1, 8, and 15 Lin et al. discloses a computer readable medium for the management, protection of electronic data and /or records, the computer readable medium comprising: logic for filling the record at a central database (server)(8) after the classification of the record; and logic for deleting the record from the remote database (5) without user intervention upon the filing of the record at the central database (See column 6, line 27-35) but Lin et al. does not discloses classification of

the record at remote computer and electronic documents. However, Suchter discloses that data files are classified at a remote computer (see column 8, line 47-51). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Lin et al.'s computer to provide the data as electronic document with classification of the record in order to have different kind of data base as electronic documents and modified the data base since such electronic documents with classification of the record at a remote computer for the stated purpose has been well known in the art as evidenced by teaching of Suchter (See column abstract).

With respect to claims 2-4, 9-11 and 16-18, Lin et al. discloses the program monitor (4) for determining whether the record is open at the remote computer (see column 5, line 1-20), the program monitor (4) adds task record to the local record file so the program monitor also determining whether the record has previously been classified (see column 5, line 14-16).

With respect to claims 5, 12, and 19, Lin et al. discloses the logic for saving the record with an associated property in a memory of the remote computer (1)(see column 4, line 17-25).

With respect to claims 7, 14, and 21, Lin et al. discloses displaying record properties (see column 3, line 1-10).

With respect to claims 13 and 20, Suchter discloses selected a plurality of records, classifying the plurality of selected records at the remote location (See fig. 3).

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,122,663) and Suchter (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,161) and in further in view of Clark et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,725,228).

With respect to claim 6, Lin et al. and Suchter disclose all limitation recited in claim 1 except for logic for bulk classification of the plurality of selected records. However, Clark et al. discloses bulk classification (see abstract). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Lin et al.'s computer and Suchter's computer to provide bulk classification in order to have different kind of data base and classification and modified the data base since such electronic documents with classification of the record at a remote computer for the stated purpose has been well known in the art as evidenced by teaching of Clark et al. (See column abstract).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung Vy whose telephone number is (571) 272-1954. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30 am - 5:30pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

application may be obtained from either private Pair or Public Pair. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private Pair only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have question on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hung T. Vy
Art Unit 2163
June 8, 2006.



DON WONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER